

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-20 are now in the application. Claim 1 has been amended to recite “an explosive pre-charge or pre-charges are arranged at the front side of the liner a periphery of the liner”, and thereby including recitations from claim 2. Accordingly, claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The claims where appropriate have also been amended to recite pre-charge or pre-charges in place of charge or pre-charges. The amendments to the claims do not introduce any new matter.

The rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph has been overcome by the amendments to the claims and/or is not deemed tenable. In particular, the claims, as amended, contain sufficient structural recitations.

The rejection of claims 1 and 9-10 under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,509,357 to Lawther has been rendered moot by the amendments to claim 1 that include recitations from prior claim 2. Claim 2 was not subject to this rejection.

Claim 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,44,589 to Held. Held does not render obvious claim 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13 and 16-20 as now amended

In particular, Held suggests a fragmentation device that will spread fragments in all directions such as a mine, but with the ability to increase the focus of the fragmentation somewhat in some chosen direction. On the other hand, the present invention relates to a device where the fragmentation is clearly directed in a forward direction with a possibility to choose between Shaped Charge Effect and a fragmentation spreading effect. The fragmentation spreading effect is achieved by deforming the liner before detonating the main charge by providing in the device one or several explosive pre-charges and wherein the pre-charge or pre-charges are arranged on the front side of the liner at a periphery of the liner.

The present invention makes it possible to change between two different effects, (i.e. Shaped Charge Effect and a fragmentation spreading effect); whereas, the device suggested by

Held has only one mode: the fragmentation effect, which may be focused somewhat in one radial direction but still there is a lot of fragments in all directions. Therefore, no possibility exists with the device suggested by Held to exclude any friendly troops or vehicles from being hit by the device suggested therein.

In view of the above, consideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes an interview might serve in any way to advance the prosecution of this application, the undersigned is available at the telephone number noted below.

The Office is authorized to charge any necessary fees due with this paper to Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 20459-00397-US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 14, 2009
BAA/prb

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Burton A. Amernick/
Burton A. Amernick
Registration No.: 24,852
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1875 Eye Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Assignee